

REMARKS

Please reconsider the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Applicant thanks the Examiner for carefully considering this application.

Disposition of Claims

Claims 1-44 were pending in this application. By way of this Reply, claims 2, 8-14, 16, 23, 30, and 36-44 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Thus, claims 1, 3-7, 15, 17-22, 24-29, and 31-35 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 15, 22, and 29 are independent. The remaining claims depend, directly or indirectly, from claims 1, 15, 22, and 29.

Claim Amendments

Claims 1, 3-7, 15, 17-22, 24-29, and 31-35 have been amended in this Reply to clarify the present invention recited. Support for these amendments may be found in, for example, the original claims and Fig. 2-6, 10, and 11. No new matter has been added.

Rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C § 112

Claims 22-28, 43, and 44 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Claims 23, 43, and 44 have been cancelled in this Reply. Claims 22 and 24-28 have been amended in this Reply to clarify the present invention recited. Thus, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 29-35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 29-35 have been amended in this Reply to

clarify the present invention recited. Thus, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C § 101

Claims 8-14 and 39-42 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 8-14 and 39-41 have been cancelled in this Reply. Thus, this rejection is now moot.

Rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C § 102

Claims 36-38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent no. 6,873,602 (“Ambe”). Claims 36-38 have been cancelled in this reply. Thus, this rejection is now moot.

Rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C § 103

Claims 1-7 and 15-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as obvious over U.S. Patent No. 5,684,800 (“Dobbins et al.”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,847,620 (“Meier”). Claims 2 and 16 have been cancelled in this reply. Claims 1, 3-7, 15, and 17-21 have been amended in this Reply to clarify the present invention recited. To the extent that this rejection may still apply to the amended claims, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1, as amended, recites a method of processing and transmitting packets over a wireless VLAN system. Specifically, claim 1, as amended, includes a limitation of “in a case where the source MAC address is judged not to exist on the second reference table, sending the source MAC address to the administrative computer to update the administrative information on the first reference table, receiving the updated administrative information from the administrative computer, and updating the second

reference table based on the updated administrative information.” Advantageously, the method of the present invention allows a wireless interconnecting device to detect whether a wireless terminal joins a group provided by the wireless interconnecting device from a group provided by another wireless interconnecting device, thereby automatically reconfiguring a VLAN group such that, wherever the wireless terminal is, connections of the wireless terminal can be established.

Dobbins et al., in contrast, fails to show or suggest at least the above limitation as recited in claim 1 as amended. Dobbins et al. merely discloses a method for establishing restricted broadcast groups within a switching fabric, known as virtual LANs. A device of Dobbins et al. refers to MAC addresses to establish connections between two end systems. This, however, is in the nature of a conventional method for processing and transmitting packets. Dobbins et al. fails to show or suggest that a reference table is updated based on whether a source MAC address included in a received packet exists on the reference table as recited in claim 1.

Further, Meier fails to teach that which Dobbins et al. lacks. Meier merely discloses a VLAN system in a wireless environment using GVRP and GMRP. Meier is completely silent with respect to updating the reference table as recited in claim 1.

In view of the above, Dobbins et al. and Meier, whether considered separately or in combination, fail to show or suggest the present invention as recited in independent claim 1 as amended. Independent claims 15, 22, and 29 also include similar limitations to claim 1. Thus, claims 1, 15, 22, and 29 as amended are patentable over Dobbins et al. and Meier. Dependent claims are allowable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 2 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as obvious over Dobbins et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,873,602 ("Ambe"). Claims 2 and 16 have been cancelled in this Reply. Thus, this rejection is now moot.

Conclusion

Applicant believes this reply is fully responsive to all outstanding issues and places this application in condition for allowance. If this belief is incorrect, or other issues arise, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned or his associates at the telephone number listed below. Please apply any charges not covered, or any credits, to Deposit Account 50-0591 (Reference Number 04610.005001).

Dated: 10/12/05

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Thomas K. Scherer
Registration No.: 45,079
OSHA • LIANG LLP
1221 McKinney St., Suite 2800
Houston, Texas 77010
Telephone: 713.228.8600
Attorney for Applicant